DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 333 EA 017 796

AUTHOR Beck, John J.
TITLE The Administrative Manager in the 21st Century: An International Perspective.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Pan-Pacific Conference II: A Business, Economic, and Technological Exchange (Seoul, South Korea, May 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Administrator Education; *Educational Administration; *Futures (of Society); Labor Force Development

ABSTRACT

Consideration of the nature of futures research and of observations about the future of management and management education leads to several conclusions about the characteristics that successful educational administrators will share in the future and the training that will be required to prepare them. Three factors complicating futures research are (1) making sure relevant problems are being posed, (2) determining how to balance the technological possibilities of the future with nontechnological influences, and (3) determining whether forecasts should focus on utility or accuracy. Still, futures research is increasingly in demand and useful forecasting tools are being developed. The currently observable global industrial transformation into an information society will require new forms of management that (1) reemphasize such current management skills as planning, organizing, and decision-making; (2) increase efforts to utilize human resources flexibly; and (3) develop new approaches to change, ethics, education, creativity, and managerial entrepreneurship. Although education is slow to change and produces a unique product, educational management must also move in such directions. Management training programs must teach how theory can be translated into practice, emphasize human resources management, involve study of global concepts, and foster entrepreneurship and creativity. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Beck, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Administrative Manager in the 21st Century: An International Perspective

by

John J. Beck, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Education

Southwest Texas State University

San Marcos, Texas 78666

Presented: May, 1985

Pan-Pacific Conference II:

A Business, Economic and Technological Exchange

Seoul, Korea

ED253333

EA 017 796

The Administrative Manager in the 21st Century: An International Perspective

by

John J. Beck, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Education

Southwest Texas State University

San Marcos, Texas 78666

ABSTRACT

This paper, presented at the second Pan-Pacific Conference on Business, Economic, and Technological Exchange, examines the future of educational administration in the international arena. Topics addressed in the paper are the nature of futures research, including the strengths and weaknesses of this strategy as a forecasting tool; an examination of the recent literature concerning the future of management and management education; and the future of educational administration as a viable body of knowledge. Finally, implications for the future training of educational administrators are drawn.

Futures research as a systematic planning tool is increasing in importance, due, in large measure, to activities on the international scence. Whether one chooses an alpha or an omega approach to the future may be of less importance than the recognition of the new interdependence of nations, increasing world population, and an increase in the scale of world activity.

The future of management and management education hinges on abilities to transform into what is commonly called the metaindustrial organization. Ways to accomplish this, including developing cosmopolitan and transformational strategies among business leaders, actualizing employee potential in organizations, and others are discussed.

Leaders of educational organizations apply similar skills to those applied in business and industrial management. These skills are applied, however, in the unique context of education.

The Administrative Manager in the Twenty-First Century:

An International Perspective

My colleagues have systematically and thoroughly provided us with a full understanding of the role of today's educational administrator. Professor Pulliam carefully traced from whence we came and concluded with a thorough description of successful educational administration as it exists today. Professor Stalcup then presented a reasoned argument to support the thesis that common strands of knowledge and skills are woven into the fabric of the administrative management function even though the organizations in which the function occurs may appear to be dissimilar.

My task for the next several minutes is simple. All I have to do is describe exactly what the world will be like in the twenty-first century, explicate trends in relationships among nations over the next fifty years, and establish bases for current action drawn from these projected descriptions and trends. A simple task, don't you agree?

What I do want to share with you are three points which bear upon a study of educational administration in the twenty-first century. First, I want to make a few comments about the nature of futures research. Second, I want to summarize some of the literature about the future of management and management education in general. Third, I will draw implications for educational administration from this literature and offer a few guidelines for management training.

Even though much disagreement exists about what exactly futures research is, allow me to begin with a relatively simple definition. Futures research is a systematic planning process which seeks to raise believable interrelated issues that may occur in the future (Loveridge, 1977). Based on this definition, the purpose of futures research, then, is to provide input to the current decision-making process.

Among the factors which bear upon the value of futures research for

decision-making, three seem to be of special significance. The first factor which complicates the work of the futurist is the nature of problems themselves. Problems can be classed as aptly-perceived or inaptly perceived, and they can be precisely-structured or imprecisely-structured. For example, the classical statistical problem is aptly-perceived and precisely-structured while a typical futures problem is almost exactly the reverse (Simmonds, 1977). A major concern of the futures researcher is, therefore, to minimize to probability of solving the wrong problem. In other words, the researcher does not want to commit an error of the third kind. The futures forecaster must learn how to recognize, formulate, solve, and implement the correct solution to the right problem (Mitroff, 1977).

The second factor which complicates futures research is the nature of the forecaster as an individual. The forecaster's values, training, experience, attitudes, etc. bear upon the kind of forecast that is made. In general, forecasters can be loosely placed into one of two groups. The alpha forecaster believes that the future will be very much like the past, only "more so." This forecaster sees no major changes in current trends, only minor adjustments in the rate of change as the future unfolds. On the other hand, the omega forecaster is characterized by a tendency to minimize organizational rigidities and political constraints. The point of view of the omega forecaster is that almost anything which the mind of man can envision can be implemented by simply concentrating our engineering efforts. The weakness of the alpha forecast is that discontinuities in trends are virtually impossible to predict. The weakness of the omega forecast is that the interaction of the various nontechnological factors may be given less emphasis than the technological factors (Ayres, 1979).

The third factor of special significance in futures research is the accuracy of the forecast. Accuracy is one of the fundamental standards by which forecasts are judged. This standard, even though it contains much face validity, is itself open to criticism, especially when compared to the standard of utility. The question which must be answered

is "Do I as the decision-maker want an accurate forecast or a useful one?" For example, a forecast that predicts some negative event in the life of an organization, but which causes action in the present which averts the crisis will score high on utility but low on accuracy (Ascher, 1978).

In spite of these difficulties inherent in futures research, the need for futures research is becoming increasingly more important. Several problems related to the complexity of life on the international scene are inextricably related to the need for this systematic planning process:

> "1. the recognition in a starkly practical sense of the interdependence of the nations and of the vulnerability of energy and raw material supplies and price levels to political as well as market forces;
> 2. the recognition of the interdependence of both problems and solutions and the need to foresee the interaction of solutions to sectoral problems with those in other areas;
> 3. the fact that world population is increasing very quickly. . . .
> 4. an increase in the scale of world activity and hence of the demand for raw materials, energy, products and services, arising from both population increase and faster economic growth;
> 5. the (apparent) rapid rate of change; and
> 6. the generalization of expectations within the industrialized countries and between the rich and the poor countries of the world" (King, 1975).

Thus, even though the need for futures research is easy to substantiate, the process of futures research is fraught with difficulties. These difficulties have not prevented, however, significant work in the area. The World Future Society has gained popularity with its research in several areas; Herman Kahn's Hudson Institute has been active for many years; and others, such as the Rand Corporation and the Brookings Institution have gained credibility in technological forecasting. Back in the 1950s, the Rand Corporation designed PPBS in an effort to incorporate forecasting into explicit governmental decision-making. Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, installed this system during his tenure, and even though PPBS did not proliferate throughout all organizations as some expected, many of vestiges of the original design are still apparent today. The Rand Corporation's most famous contribution to futures research was probably the development of the Delphi Technique. This approach to forecasting, developed in the early 1960s, has

proved to be a fruitful method of technological-breakthrough forecasting. Also during the late 1960s, the Brookings Institution contributed to the management decision-making process with its significant works on econometric forecasting models (Ascher, 1978).

As you recall from my opening comments, my second objective for this presentation is to summarize some of the literature related to the future of management and of management education. Even though this will help to narrow the focus of our discussion, it may do little to limit the scope of the difficulties associated with the topic.

In order to justify the need for futures research in management, Dennis Meadows (King, 1975) first made the analogy between management complexity and the steering of an ocean liner. Owing to its momentum, many miles are needed to change the course of the liner. The liner needs early warnings from radar to avoid rocks ahead. Thus, management needs futures research, its early warning radar. What, then, are some of these early warnings provided to us by futures researchers in administration and management?

We all recognize that we are in the early stages of a global industrial transformation. Knowledge is the world's new major resource. Since the mid 70s, fifty per cent of American workers have been in the information/knowledge/education industries, and by the year 2000, two-thirds of all American workers are expected to be engaged in these industries. Trends of differing magnitudes but in the same direction are occurring in all industrialized nations of the world. Three factors can be identified which are the major influences in propelling this industrial transformation:

1. technological innovations
2. technology transfer
3. the global marketplace

Because of these three factors, the old attitudes, regulations, and mechanisms no longer work in the emerging information society (Harris, 1983). Thus, as we consider future issues, it seems apparent that these issues will be inextricably tied to this beginning, but

still unrealized, industrial transformation.

Philip Harris, in his book, New World, New Ways, and New Management, published in 1983, offers four steps for easing the transformation into what he calls "the metaindustrial organization:"

1. Improving management planning and effectiveness: In order to achieve this improvement, managers of the future must be skilled in planning, climate setting, organizing, and decision-making. The alpha forecaster will feel comfortable with this projected trend because the art and science of management which has been refined during this century can be partially transformed and made relevant for the twenty-first century.

2. Developing cosmopolitan and transformational strategies: This projected trend is also obvious by observers of today's scene. The notion that today's executives cannot afford to be too conservative, provincial, or enthnocentric in their thinking and planning (Harris, p. 267) will become state of the art in the twenty-first century. We are already seeing evidence of the early stages of these cosmopolitan and transformational strategies in the recent pacific-rim ventures. Far Eastern Economic Review editor Derek Davies observed recently that "The 21st Century is the Pacific Century" (Harris, p. 248). Recently on a television news program about the automobile industry, I heard an automobile expert describe the car of 1995. He said that it would not be U. S. made or Japanese made or Korean made, but rather would be an assemblage of the combined works of many countries, all of them Pacific-rim countries.

3. Actualizing employee potential: Organizations of the future will base their control and effectiveness on the growth and accomplishments of persons within the organization (Harris, p. 272).

4. Becoming more professional managers: The universal motto of successful managers in the twenty-first century will be "management is the magic of combining

individuals who are fulfilling their potential as human beings into groups that enjoy success in acheivement" (Harris, p. 282). This human resources approach to management, just emerging in recent times, will become the modus operandi of the 21st Century.

Ronald Lippitt (1979), writing on the preparation of managers for today and tomorrow in a book entitled The Future of Management Education, offers six cutting-edge contexts for management:

1. Maintaining quality in a downsizing environment
2. Sharing power and responsibility expectations
3. Gaining interdependence, collaboration, and communication
4. Using more different heads for problem-solving
5. Integrating technological and human resources
6. Developing a perspective of reorientation, renewal, and new competency development

These two projections reveal thematic patterns in the literature on the future of management. The works from other sources reinforce these themes. Recently, six hundred management educators, after addressing the topic of managers for the 21st Century, arrived at these conclusions:

> "* Management curricula will shift in orientation from functional to behavioral, and will include new teaching methods, such as "hands on" project work.
> * Management schools . . . will have to include the teaching of entrepreneurship . . . .
> * Noncognitive skills will become more important for business students than cognitive ones, and negotiating skills will have to be enhanced.
> * There will be more emphasis on ethics, morals, and the process of learning, as well as on the quality of the output.
> * There will be greater allowance in management education for the exercise of creativity, flexibility, and democracy" (Harris, p 163).

Thus, as we review the future of management from the literature, what do we find? We find that some of the things we are doing well today, we must continue doing well. These include skills in planning, climate setting, organizing, and decision-making. We find that some of the things with which we have a brief history, we must improve upon.

These include skills in actualizing employee potential, sharing power and responsibility expectations, and other behaviorally-related skills. We find that some of the things that we are doing little or none of today must become routine in 21st Century management. These include emphasis on cosmopolitan and transformational strategies; emphasis on ethics, morals, and the process of learning; emphasis on creativity, fliexibility, and democracy in management; and emphasis on entrepreneurship in management.

This very brief discussion of the future of futures and the future of management has served, I believe, to set the stage for a discussion of the future of educational administration. With minor exceptions, the problems facing administrators of schools throughout the world are similar and will become even more similar in the future to problems encountered by managers in the private sector.

Before we weave the future of educational administration with the future of management in general, let us examine some of the perceived unique aspects of the educational enterprise. A crucial problem in education is that the rates of change in society are greater than in education, and these differing rates of change tend to widen the gap between societal expectations and what education can deliver in its present structure. It seems doubtful that this gap can be closed by continuing to educate with the current narrow focus (Laslo, 1979). Thus, even though rates of change are recognized and attempts are made to reduce the gap, many writers believe that there will be less real educational change in the short-range future than there are subjective and objective reasons to expect such change (Clifford, 1981 and Ravitch, 1983).

Several reasons can be substantiated which help to explain why schools change so slowly in the United States, and several of these reasons can be generalized to educational systems in other countries. Among the management-related reasons are:

1. Resistance to change from the environment-communities (and governments), in general, do not encourage change unless they detect some form of crisis in the internal functioning of the educational system.

2. Incompetence of outside agents-the majority of parents and community and government officials know very little about learning and teaching and not much encouragement is given to them to leave their realm of ignorance.

3. Absence of a change agent or "linking pin."

4. Incomplete linkage between theory and practice

5. Conservatism in matters educational (Morrish, 1978)

Another management related problem is that the product of education is unique. The central purpose of schools is learning, that is, to educate people, and everything in the design, organization, and operation of schools must be directed toward providing the optimal environment for the achievement of instructional goals, that is, to produce a learned person. Although general concepts from the management sciences are relevant to education, their application must be guided by a unique focus and adapted to the daily tasks which school administrators face in developing and sustaining an optimal instructional environment.

Unfortunately, there is an irreducible uncertainty about this product of education. "Learning what people have learned is also a learning process. How then do we learn what we have learned about what people have learned? This irreducible dilemma yields an infinite regression." (Boulding, 1975)

Even though it may appear that I am about to conclude that there is no hope for the future of education, rest assured that this is not the case. Admittedly, the task is difficult and the challenge onerous, but if we are to broaden our base for decision-making today, the challenge must be accepted and the task begun.

As we look to the future of management in general and educational administration specifically, common threads in current thinking can be found. Harold Geneen, former president and chief executive of ITT cautions us that "business is not a science." He writes that he is wary of business leaders steeped in modern scientific management because theories and formulas do not work in the business world (Geneen, 1984).

Similarly, Kenneth Boulding concludes that "we must look with disfavor on the current trends toward accountability, greater administrative control, and the quantification of results in education." (Boulding, 1975).

Now that we have briefly examined some of the literature concerning management life in the 21st Century, what can we conclude about the educational administrator of the future? Based upon futures research in management and tempered by the unique characteristics of the educational enterprise, I believe that we can paint a picture of the successful administrator of the future. The successful educational administrator of the 21st Century will exhibit these characteristics:

1. He/she will exhibit improved management planning and effectiveness skills. He/she will be skilled in both strategic and operational management planning, climate-setting, and he/she will have fine-tuned the traditional skills of organizing and decision-making.

2. He/she will exhibit improved skills in human resources management. He/she will be skilled in sharing power and responsibility, skilled in shared decision-making, skilled in actualizing teacher potential, and, in general, skilled in combining individual teachers who are fulfilling their potential as human beings into groups that enjoy success in the achievement of school goals, that is, student learning.

These two characteristics are obviously alpha forecasts because they are extensions of the present. We are beginning to see successful educational administrators exercise these skills; however, I daresay that administrators with these skills are still in the minority today.

The next two characteristics of the educational administrator require an omega forecast because each will require a significant change from current practice:

3. The educational administrator of the 21st Century will be skilled in developing cosmopolitan and transformational strategies. Just as the managers in business and industry will not be able to affort to be too conservative, provincial, or ethno-

centric in their thinking and planning, neither will the educational administrator. He/she will have to be aware of the global context and be able to act with the knowledge that decisions made will probably cross cultural as well as political boundaries. He or she must be able to look beyond the institution of the school in order to orchestrate a network of educational opportunities and learning experiences beyond the school (Mitchell, 1981). This set of skills will require a thorough study of other cultures and nations, especially those of the Pacific rim, and multi-lingual skills may be a necessity.

4. The educational administrator of the 21st Century will be an educational entrepreneur. He/she will be the central figure responsible for assuming the risks for educational ventures. If we are ever to close the gap between education and society created by different rates of change, then entrepreneural skills appear to be a necessity. The exercise of creativity and flexibility brought about by entrepreneurship will provide the impetus for quantum leaps forward in educational productivity.

The final question is "How do we prepare administrators so that they have these needed skills?" Among the guidelines for the preparation of school leaders, the following seem appropriate and are implied from the four 21st Century educational administrator characteristics:

1. Preparation programs must insure that management theory is translated into management practice. It seems apparent that management trainees do poorly in transferring theory into practice on their own. They must be shown and they must be led to discover how theory can be effectively used to help explain, describe, and predict organizational and human behavior.

2. Preparation programs must focus on preparing human resources managers. We see harbingers today of the focus needed through the introduction of clinical supervision, quality circles, and organizational development, but these and other yet

to be discovered strategies must take the forefront in administrator preparation rather than the current approach whereby human resources strategies are relegated to the same level as scientific management and human relations management, concepts which have already outlived their usefulness. Pulliam (1979) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) are three among several recognized experts who propose human resources management as the trend for the future.

3. Preparation programs must devote time to the study of global concepts. In order to insure that administrators of the future will be able to manage schools where their graduates are able to succeed on an international as well as a national scope, school leaders must understand infinitely more about the cultures, politics, languages, economics, and education systems of the new international order. Short on-the-job development seminars on these and similar topics may be a feasible means to deliver these skills.

4. Preparation programs must foster entrepreneurship and creativity among their trainees. We do know that it is possible to teach creativity. We also know, unfortunately, that risk-taking, entrepreneurship, and creativity are seldom rewarded in the organization we call school. It seems to me that we must work to further eliminate some of the bureaucratic tendencies of schools in order to develop a more professional organization (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1983). When we encourage risk-taking, innovation, and creativity by rewarding it, then we are more likely to see the emergence of the entreprenerual leader.

Many early warning signs are evident to us today and futures research provides us with others. Unless we pay heed to these signs as we make today's decisions, we run an increasing risk of crashing on the rocks of failure, thereby leaving the management of schools and the preparation of these managers to unknown others.

NOTES

Ascher, William. Forecasting: An Appraisal for Policy-Makers and Planners. Baltimore(The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 239 pages.

Ayers, Robert. Uncertain Futures: Challenges for Decision-Makers New York(John Wiley and Sons, 1979), 429 pages.

Boulding, Kenneth E., "Predictive Reliability and the Future: The Need for Uncertainty," The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling, Louis Rubin (Ed.). Boston(Allyn and Bacon, 1975), 57-74.

Bowman, Jim, Fred Kierstead, Chris Dede, and John Pulliam. The Far Side of the Future: Social Problems and Educational Reconstruction. Washington, D. C.(World Future Society, 1978), 153 pages.

Cetron, Marvin and Thomas O'Toole. Encounters With the Future: A Forecast of Life Into the 21st Century. New York(McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982), 308 pages.

Churchman, C. West, "A Philosophy for Complexity," Futures Research: New Directions, Harold A Linstone and W.H. Clive Simmonds, (Eds.). Reading, Massachusetts(Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977), 82-90.

Clifford, Geraldine, "Past is Prologue," The Future of Education: Policy, Issues and Challenges, Kathryn Cirincione-Coles, (Ed.). Beverly Hills, California(Sage Publications, 1981), 25-34.

Geneen, Harold S., "Theory G", Management, Vol. 38(November, 1984), 60-70.

Harris, Philip R. New World, New Ways, New Management. New York(AMACOM Book Division, American Management Association, 1983), 324 pages.

King, Alexander, "The Future as a Discipline and the Future of Disciplines," The Future As An Academic Discipline: Ciba Foundation Symposium 36. Amsterdam(Elsevier/Excerpta Medica/North Holland, P.O. Box 211, 1975), 35-47.

Laslo, Ervin, "The Education of Educators," Educational Futures: Sourcebook I, Fred Kierstead, Jim Bowman, and Christopher Dede, (Eds.). Washington, D. C.(World Future Society, 1979), 49-55.

Lippitt, Ronald, "The Preparation and Nurturance of Managers: For Today and Tomorrow," The Future of Management Education, Andrew Kakabadse and Suresh Mukhi, (Eds.). New York(Nichols Publishing Company, 1979), 360-369.

Loveridge, Denis J., "Values and Futures," Futures Research: New Directions, Harold A. Linstone and W. H. Clive Simmonds, (Eds.). Reading, Massachusetts(Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977), 53-64.

Mitchell, "Educational Leadership: Confronting Crisis With Style, " The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling, Louis Rubin, (Ed.). Boston(Allyn and Bacon, 1975), 35-42.

Mitroff, Ian I., "On the Error of the Third Kind," Futures Research: New Directions, Harold A. Linstone and W. H. Clive Simmonds, (Eds.). Reading,

Massachusetts(Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977), 45-52.

Morrish, Ivor. Aspects of Educational Change. New York(John Wiley and Sons, 1976), 178 pages.

Pulliam, John D., "Toward a Futuristic Theory of Education," Educational Futures: Sourcebook I, Fred Kierstead, Jim Bowman, and Christopher Dede, (Eds.). Washington, D. C.(World Future Society, 1979), 56-63.

Ravitch, Diane. The Troubled Crusade. New York(Basic Books, Inc., 1983), 384 pages.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starratt. Supervision: Human Perspectives, Third Edition. New York(McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1983), 366 pages.

Simmonds, W. H. Clive, "The Nature of Futures Problems," Futures Research: New Directions, Harold A. Linstone and W. H. Clive Simmonds, (Eds.). Reading, Massachusetts(Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977), 13-26.

Weaver, W. Timothy, "Growth, Distribution, and Professional Frame of Reference," Images of the Future: the Twenty-First Century and Beyond, Robert Bundy, (Ed.). Buffalo, New York(Prometheus Books, 1976), 193-206.